HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XV, No. 37 Monday, September 15, 1958 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

AS WENT MAINE: *So went 'me-tooism'*....(page 1)

FORMOSA FRONT: *Monsoons and Dulles*..(page 2)

CALIFORNIA: *Nixon and Knowland*.....(page 2)

LABOR: *The Reuther pattern*.....(page 3)

SCHOOL 'CRISIS': *No crisis*.....(page 3)

As Maine Goes: A blueprint of what looms as a Democratic victory in November emerged from the Maine election last week, and challenges the Republican GHQ. Yet that body, impregnated with "me-tooism," still fails to read the lesson and to utilize a more successful strategy to prevent or modify the expected somber result two months hence.

Capitol Hill sees the picture clearly and echoes with comments that Modern Republicanism went down to a humiliating defeat again when Senator Frederick G. Payne, Republican of Maine, was crushed by Democratic Governor Edmund S. Muskie. For, in the halls of Congress in recent years, Payne slavishly accepted the White House "liberal" line in his voting.* In the last session, Capitol Hill staff people remarked, he voted consistently for big spending and welfare state measures of a New Deal character, and bowed to the bidding of the labor lobby in voting against labor reform measures demanded by conservative Senators Knowland, Goldwater, Curtis and Mundt. A prominent New England Senator who watched this Payne performance remarked, "Why shouldn't Maine voters, including conservatives, vote for 'liberal' (and highly personable) Muskie rather than for the equally 'liberal' but ill and aging Payne?"

● Not only did Payne alienate conservatives in his state by his voting record in the Senate, but he also prevented the rest of his ticket from waging a positive, conservative campaign—from taking the offensive and lambasting the Democrats for "Reutherism." He reportedly told one GOP Congressional candidate (who was defeated) that he (Payne) would publicly repudiate him if the latter attacked Reutherism. Militant conservatives in the Maine GOP who had prepared extensive campaign material along the anti-Reuther line found themselves bound, gagged and completely thwarted.

The Payne-Muskie contest dominated the election—unlike in most states, where the Congressional contests assume less importance than the state offices fight. GOP candidate for Governor Horace A. Hildreth, a conservative, proved a colorless candidate, had been absent from the state for many years and had his conservatism in the campaign muted by the dominant Payne. As it was, his vote ran ahead of Payne's.

Yet, Payne's pro-labor stand did not win him labor votes—quite to the contrary. It was confirmation of the old adage—you don't gain votes by turning leftist; you only lose your old friends.

For the national labor lobby moved in and assumed control of the campaign against him, spending huge sums of money in a lavish manner. Thus, Democratic Muskie had over a hundred billboards out early in the race, Payne none. (The cost of these ran well into five figures, it is estimated.) An example of the wild spending of labor union dues was a four-page ad for Muskie in the Bangor *News*, a pro-Payne paper. State labor organizations paid for many other ads. Observers found paid solicitors for Muskie everywhere in the cities—Portland, Biddeford, Waterville, Lewiston and even in smaller places. This takes money, the pros remarked. Finally, Alonzo Young, one of the leaders of the AFL-CIO's national political organization, took over the reins in Maine six weeks before election day and reportedly pushed spending to an unprecedented degree.

This labor factor in Payne's downfall assumes—in the eyes of Washingtonians—more importance than does popular criticism of Payne's indebtedness to textile tycoon Bernard Goldfine. However, no one in Washington minimizes the voting consequences of the Payne-Goldfine relationship, and the exit of Sherman Adams from the White House is called for.

Labor's success in Maine has given added impetus to industry's developing participation in political action. Two days after Maine, Gulf Oil Company served notice publicly that it plans to give organized labor a battle in the political arena. Other industrialists reportedly are reacting similarly. Washington proponents of business-in-politics remark that if Gulf really means what it says it should immediately rush help to Knowland in California. He is in trouble and the labor bosses have marked him for slaughter.

● An object lesson (as a contrast to Payne's "me-too" course) loomed in last Tuesday's voting in Wisconsin. There incumbent Democratic Senator William Proxmire, in a three-way contested primary race, scored 210,000 votes; Republican Senatorial candidate Roland Steinle, who had no opponent, topped Proxmire's score with 219,000. The Democratic vote did not increase over 1954, although there were contests (primary contests nearly always bring out a larger vote); and the GOP vote was high, even though there were no real contests in the GOP primary. This is regarded by politicos as a good augury for a Steinle victory in November. This well-liked Wisconsin Republican Judge, backed by a united party, is known as a fighting conservative who does not modify his position by any "me-too" considerations.

● Victory for incumbent Senator Spessard Holland in Florida over his primary opponent, former Senator

* His one rebellion against Ike was his opposition to the Reciprocal Trade bill.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Claude Pepper, is interpreted in Washington as (1) further sign that the South is stiffening its stand against desegregation (Holland was stronger in favor of segregation than Pepper); (2) that Pepper's pro-Communist record in the Senate [1945-50] told against him in this contest as well as in 1950, when the voters retired him from office; and (3) that Holland's conservative record in the Senate stood him in good stead in fighting Pepper, who ran on a spending and New Deal platform.

Admiral Ben Moreell, Chairman of the Americans for Constitutional Action (ACA), today hailed the victory of Senator Holland as "an example of what can be done at the polls when conservative forces unite."

"The Holland victory in Florida," Admiral Moreell said, "is very encouraging to all those who believe that Americans who think alike must unite to preserve the American heritage of sound constitutional government and individual enterprise."

Formosa Crisis: Along Washington's diplomatic row, the scorecards rate Secretary of State Dulles rather high in the diplomatic contest over Formosa, the Matsus and Quemoy. Foreign diplomats admire Dulles' resourcefulness and his courage in face of criticism. They also praise Ike for his strong TV speech of September 11.

These pros believe that Dulles has pretty well won out in the back-and-forth of diplomacy so far, and they discount apparent concessions made by Dulles in his press conference last Tuesday. "He's a wily lawyer, and if I were the enemy I wouldn't take that as a concession yet."

They further point out what isn't mentioned in American comment and news—that some of Dulles' "sweet talk" probably arises from his strategy to string out "talk" until the monsoon rains arrive (reports today indicate they are starting). It seems unlikely that the Chinese Reds would start hostilities under monsoon conditions.

Diplomats who have consistently claimed that the Chinese Reds never "really meant business" note numerous foreign dispatches and broadcasts indicating that what has prompted their sabre-rattling has been hope that the US would yield to a Summit conference, in which they would be a participant, and would also yield to Red claims for entrance into the UN. The "breakthrough" by the Chinese Reds on this front (highly prized by Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai) has not yet occurred. The projected conference between US Ambassador Jacob Beam and the Red Chinese emissary Wang Ping-nan has no agenda save for discussion of exchange of prisoners from the late Korean war.

● The chanceries of diplomatic row evince amusement at what they call "naive" arguments advanced by New Deal Democrats criticizing Dulles' "brinkmanship." One of these is that Quemoy is as close to Red Chinese territory as Staten Island is to New York; *ergo,* give it up. When—ask these diplomats—has "contiguity" constituted a valid argument for the enemy claiming territory or the US giving it up? If "contiguity" is valid, then why does not the free world give up Berlin (completely surrounded by slave territory), Hong Kong and the Portuguese possession, Macao? The Chinese Reds have at various times in their propaganda laid claim to the latter. Yet, no one hears the British talking about the contiguity of Hong Kong as a plea for surrender.

Diplomatic row evaluates as "common sense" the American military's argument that surrendering Quemoy, Matsu and Formosa would topple over other "dominoes," wiping out our series of air and naval bases all over the world and removing our Air Force's deterrent power, which is the principal factor defending American cities from Soviet bombers. They point out that the timid policy of the US in Indo-China four years ago led to the subsequent loss of Laos, Burma and Indonesia to the Communist sphere. Appeasement in the China Strait might lead in the course of a short time to loss of Pakistan, the rest of Indo-China, the Philippines and South Korea, not to mention Japan and the Middle East. The "dominoes" metaphor makes sense to the pros.

On Capitol Hill, similar rebuttals arise. It is noted that Democratic Whip Senator Mansfield has been bristling with criticism of Dulles' course. Yet, it is recalled that this Democratic leader, as well as a majority of the Democrats, voted for the resolution two years ago giving Ike power to intervene to save Quemoy and the Matsus.

Similarly, Capitol Hill knows that Chiang Kai-shek did not "entice" us into the advanced "exposed" position in these islands. It was the US Government which forced a reluctant Formosa regime into them, and fortified them at our own expense, with our technical advice.

Finally, all Washington is having a laugh at the spectacle of Dean Acheson furiously attacking Dulles for his policy. It is recalled that it was Acheson who, many months before the event, publicly made clear that the US had no intention of defending Korea; then, when the North Korean Reds attacked, Acheson reversed himself and plunged the US into that war—in which Acheson's controversial policy cost the Nation dearly in lives and treasure.

But the Republicans also get the horse laugh from Democrats for Ike's deportment during the crisis. "Up in Newport playing golf" is one taunt. The other is a story from reliable sources of Ike's "bellicose stance" in a meeting with the National Defense Security Council just before he went to Newport. While high members of the military and State departments solemnly presented a picture of the comparative strengths of Red China and the US in the China Sea, Ike was observed working his wrists in simulation of holding a golf club. When the President noted that his experts were casting glances at his wrist, he interrupted to explain as follows: "I'm worried about my strokes in the past week; I seem to be always slicing."

The California Story—Nixon: When Vice President Nixon last week laid down a bold tax-cutting program to stimulate business and investment, Capital opinion rated his move as an attempt to consolidate conservatives behind him in the first lap of his race for the Presidency in 1960. For the election campaign this fall looms as critically important to the young Vice President. And reports from the Golden State indicate conservatives

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there realize that Nixon's and Knowland's fortunes are indissolubly woven together. "A vote for Knowland is a vote for Nixon."

Nixon is charting an aggressive program in his native state to help the election of Senator Knowland against Democratic candidate Attorney General Pat Brown. Nixon realizes the importance of having Knowland in the Governor's chair come 1960, when the Golden State's GOP will send a powerful delegation to the Republican convention to nominate the party's Presidential candidate. If Knowland becomes Governor, there will be little doubt that he'll swing the delegation behind Nixon.

This consideration takes on added importance, as a roadblock to Nixon's Presidential nomination appears in another quarter. Nelson Rockefeller won the GOP nomination for Governorship in New York two weeks ago and his followers believe he enjoys an excellent chance of beating incumbent Averell Harriman in November. If that happens (and there runs much dissent that it will), Rockefeller in the state house in Albany will undoubtedly follow "the Albany tradition" (of Theodore Roosevelt, Grover Cleveland, Al Smith and Tom Dewey) and seek the GOP Presidential nomination in '60 himself. Indeed, the nomination of Rockefeller and his reputed plan to follow "the Albany tradition" if elected is said to be the handiwork of Tom Dewey, himself the "kingmaker" who put over the nomination of Eisenhower.

Nixon has no great love for Dewey, who sought to oust him from the Vice Presidential race in 1952, and his strong ties with the conservative wing of the Republican party has made Nixon *persona non grata* to the "liberal" group which pushed Rockefeller (himself a "liberal" trained by Franklin D. Roosevelt).

Hence many California conservatives perceive that it is doubly important that Knowland win the Governor's mansion in Sacramento this year, for that would mean a pro-Nixon delegation to the GOP convention in 1960. They figure that, with Nixon whole-heartedly stumping the Golden State for Knowland, odds on Knowland's election will sharply rise.

Labor Front: A recent startling story on Capitol Hill—observers say—highlighted two revelations which add to the fuel making the scandal of the labor bosses the most incandescent topic from one end of the country to the other. The two discoveries were: (1) the bloody influence of Reuther's CIO on the traditionally moderate AFL; and (2) the growing bias of Senator John McClellan and his Counsel Robert Kennedy for Reuther and against Hoffa, the Teamsters head and Reuther's biggest foe among the union bosses.

The blood-and-guts pattern of Reuther's strike activities was bared under oath, not by one of Hoffa's minions, but by a witness (before the McClellan Committee) regarded as "adverse to Hoffa" and called to the witness chair on August 26 by Counsel Robert Kennedy. The witness was Thomas L. Moran, Captain of Detectives of the St. Louis, Missouri, police department, and he was called to testify about violent activities of Hoffa's Teamsters union in that city. Captain Moran traced the character of Teamsters violence in St. Louis, under the direction of local Teamsters boss Harold Gibbons, back to the CIO. (Gibbons, formerly with the CIO, broke with that organization in 1948, formed an independent union, then merged it with the Teamsters.)

Captain Moran said the violence under the Teamsters was "the same pattern" as used in the CIO. "Going back long before Mr. Gibbons joined the Teamsters movement, we would have serious trouble with CIO organizers, they were a more militant group and they were more apt to cause violence . . . they were great advocates of mass picketing where they would have large numbers of people surround the building, actually more people than could actually sit in the space they were using, a number of people that would cause the police department to bring out large details of men to keep the peace. That was a common CIO practice. It was a practice that the AFL, not only Teamsters, but all the AFL unions in St. Louis did not indulge in. After Mr. Gibbons came into the AFL by virtue of the merger with 688, then we began to get mass picketing from the Teamsters Local 688 and we had the same type of trouble as far as the police department is concerned . . . "

Those who covered Captain Moran's testimony at once recognized the pattern described as the same labor violence employed by Reuther's goons against the employees of the Kohler Company and the Perfect Circle Company (both investigated by the McClellan Committee). It was expected that Chairman McClellan and/or his Counsel Robert Kennedy would follow up Moran's testimony and make something out of it—along the line that such a pattern of violence constitutes one of the great evils of the labor boss problem today.

On the contrary, McClellan and Kennedy hastily dropped the subject and sought in their questioning to develop material on corruption in the Teamsters union in St. Louis. Corruption is Reuther's main charge against his rival, Hoffa.

Old hands on the Hill characterize this interesting episode as typical of the McClellan-Kennedy strategy in the hearings of the Senate Rackets Committee—to gloss over or fail to follow up the sins of the CIO and Reuther, and to concentrate day after day on the misdeeds of Hoffa.

School 'Crisis': "What happened to the school crisis?" is the question being asked in Capital circles these days, as the Nation's schools open for the fall term. It is remembered that just a few weeks ago, when Congress was considering the mis-named "National Defense Education Act," educational bureaucrats professed to be worried to a frenzy over supposed shortages of funds and teachers. Reliable reports seem to indicate, however, that since the passage of the Federal-aid-to-education bill these "shortages" have been replaced by surpluses.

A recent conference of high school counselors, meeting at Teachers College, Columbia University, was told, for instance, that the "panic" on college admissions is largely manufactured—and that plenty of room will be available in colleges across the Nation until 1960. Similarly, the New England Board of Higher Education has found 2,357 freshman vacancies in the six New England states. New York State alone—which is not considered part of the "New England" group—has "at least" 2,500 vacancies, according to the state's education department.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And, a report from Ohio's assistant school superintendent, Harold J. Bowers, sounds an optimistic note on the expected shortage of high school mathematics and science teachers in that state—finding that, instead, there have been "no unusual requests or indications there is a shortage."

Opponents of Federal aid are angry, however, over a report on college loan funds issued by the US Office of Education last week. The "National Defense Education Act," as passed by Congress on August 23, earmarks $295 million for loans to college students. Last week's Office of Education report, however, brings new facts to light which add strength to the view that Federal loan grants are totally unnecessary. So the question is asked—why did the Office of Education wait until the Federal aid bill was passed and Congress adjourned before it issued this report? Among the findings of the report:

● *More than $26 million is available for student loans at 767 colleges and universities across the Nation. Nearly half of this amount went unused in 1955-'56, the study showed. An additional 49 colleges and universities with loan resources of $538,000 had no borrowers at all.*

● Only 6.5 per cent of all full-time students in these institutions borrowed from college funds, and the average total loan was $162—"relatively small," the report said. The median amount owed by seniors at graduation was only $284.

● *When asked why students do not borrow from college loan funds, almost half of the administrators answered "the preference of students to work rather than borrow." Another 20 per cent said that need was met by scholarships and fellowships and 15 per cent declared there was "no need for assistance."*

Spend and Spend: A study of Congressional appropriations prepared by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce (1025 Connecticut Ave., NW, Washington 6, D.C.) concludes that this year's session of the 85th Congress "set at least one record to which it can lay undisputed claim . . . by enacting spending authorizations in far greater dollar amount than did any other Congress in any single peacetime year." This year's appropriations alone, the study reveals, surpass the total approved in both years of the 80th Congress just a decade ago. Fiscal 1959 expenditures, it added, "will exceed the 1958 total by $7 billion."

● Only a coalition of Republicans and conservative Democrats stopped even wilder spending by Congress this year, warns Rep. James B. Utt (R.-Calif.) in a letter to his constituents. Utt adds that a predominently "liberal" Congress—along with the election of a "liberal" President in 1960—might result in a "$60 billion annual deficit which, if paid for 'as-you-go' would necessitate an 80 per cent increase of every tax on the books. The corporation tax is now in excess of 50 per cent and the man in the lowest tax bracket would find himself in the 40 per cent bracket. You already work four months out of the year to pay your current taxes, and you would find yourself working eight months for the Government without pay, and trying to survive on four months of income."

The only other alternative, reminded the economy-conscious solon, would be drastic inflation which "would then destroy every retirement benefit, both public and private, every insurance policy, savings account, and every dollar which you have put into Government bonds."

Smith Act: In testimony earlier this year before a House subcommittee, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover disclosed that, to that date, "court decisions" had struck down 49 of the 108 convictions of Communists found guilty under the Smith Act (see HUMAN EVENTS for May 12, 1958). These High Court decisions—and the termination of many prisoners' sentences—have subsequently reduced the number of standing convictions to two.

Last week The Worker, successor to the now-defunct Daily Worker, touched off a campaign to release from prison these last remaining Smith Act prisoners, Henry Winston and Gilbert Green. The two prominent leaders of the Communist party are currently serving eight-year terms, and become eligible for parole in October upon completion of one third of their sentence.

The Worker—noting with optimism that "there is a real possibilty to win parole for them"—urged its readers to write the President for amnesty, and to write the US Board of Parole (HOLC Building, First and D Streets, NW, Washington 25, D.C.). In the Capital, anti-Communists express hope that patriots throughout the Nation will also write the Parole Board, to counteract the Communist campaign and to urge the board members to stand firm against release of these top Communist agents.

Congratulations: October 4 marks the fourth anniversary of the Manion Forum, South Bend, Indiana, formed in 1954 by noted constitutional lawyer Clarence E. Manion. Despite censorship attempts (see HUMAN EVENTS for October 26, 1957), the Forum has grown steadily from its original network of 29 radio stations. Today Dean Clarence Manion—and the leading conservatives he interviews—reach a coast-to-coast radio audience through the broadcasts of the Manion Forum.

HIS EXCELLENCY, The Most Rev. THOMAS K. GORMAN, Bishop of Dallas and Fort Worth: "With great interest do I look forward to the weekly visit of HUMAN EVENTS to my study. Its background material and shrewd comment throws much light into the sometimes dark corners of the contemporary scene. Such information cannot but be helpful to one deeply interested in current happenings."

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In lots of 5000 $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, and 1957 volumes available.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
M. STANTON EVANS, *Managing Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second-class matter, Washington, D. C. Copyright 1958.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 37 HUMAN EVENTS September 15, 1958
Article Section Printed in Two Sections

THE SICKNESS OF OUR SCHOOLS: 'PROGRESSIVE' EDUCATION
And How to Cure It

By E. MERRILL ROOT

AMID THE CONFUSION that pedagogues draw from their false premises and the din of doubtful talk that emanates from Washington, we need some higher living and plainer thinking. For the question is mortal for America: To be—or not to be? Somehow we must see to it that education no longer coddles the yeggheads and pampers the eggheads, like some new academic pink Camay, but that it brings about a renaissance of intellect and integrity, of wisdom and will.

Collectivists, from the savage Communists to the suave socialists (who are only house-broken Communists), have always planned to destroy us, not by outer attack, but by inward subversion: by confusing our minds and paralyzing our wills. They plan to subvert the mind of America by brainwashing it to believe that Government is to do everything and private initiative nothing; that the state is our orderly policeman from the cradle to the grave; that free enterprise is piracy and private property a sin.

If they can hypnotize us into these idiocies, till we set mass above man, make Government the mortal god of man's idolatry, and suppose positivism the measure of all things, why should they roll the tanks or drop the bombs? Collectivism is already here!

The collectivists plan to destroy us first through subversion of our education. They seek to infiltrate our schools and subvert the captive audience of our youth. The coming of the Sputniks has in no way changed that plan: it is, at worst, simply a red herring to divert our attention from the real menace in the classroom to the fantastic bogey-missile of the skies. The collectivist design after Sputnik is exactly the collectivist design before Sputnik. The design is now to panic us about a clever lump of dead matter till we forget their conquest of the once living American mind.

In that design—to our shame—they have largely succeeded. The shadow of the Sputnik has driven too many people—and all the "liberals"—into an intellectual tizzy. The moon herself could not have stricken the American mind with a more fantastic lunacy.

Our first reaction to the Soviet satellite announcements was not one of calm reason and resolute will, but panic, defeatism, talk of compromise and surrender, resurgence of the new Munich-men—all due to the intellectual softening-up and spiritual subversion which had already occurred. Too many Americans acted as if they heard the trumpets of doom blowing for Judgment Day. Too many Americans were like the 95-year-old grandmother who did nothing but read her Bible, until her little great-grandson told his curious pal that she must be "cramming for her finals."

H. G. WELLS once wrote of a pestiferous sort of men whom he called "Godsakers." They, in any crisis, ran around shouting: "For God's sake let's do something!" And in their haste to "do something," half of them jumped over the first cliff and the other half burned down the last fire station. Under the shadow of the Sputnik (and the much more serious exposé of what the pedagogues have called "education"), most of our commentators, Government officials, and the public, have been Godsakers on a binge of panic. Only one thing—an idiocy—has clearly emerged from all our pother: *the educationalists, as always, demanded Federal aid to education; the bureaucrats, as always, advocated Federal aid to education. The result: a "National Defense Education Act."*

But we radical conservatives avoided this orgy of panic. We were not surprised at the failure of "education" to prepare us to launch a Sputnik or to meet the fact of the Sputnik once it was launched. We alone have been right all along, for we have seen and said that our "education" has been wrong. We alone have said that "progressive" education, sliding imperceptibly into what we may call "social education," has been hostile to discipline, to fundamental brain power, to sturdy, sustained study, to the classics of literature, art, science, philosophy, religion—that is, to the first and last things without which we die, and by which we live.

We alone have said that "education" has devoted itself to the folly called "life adjustment," the illusion called "togetherness," and has substituted for

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

intellectual rigor the glorified bull-sessions of adolescents who have never successfully run even a peanut stand.

We have said all along that, thanks to "education," Johnny can't read. Now if Johnny can't read, how can Johnny delve into the intricacies of science? We have said all along that Johnny can't add, subtract, divide, multiply. Now if Johnny doesn't know his multiplication tables . . . or if Johnny adds two and two and gets three today and 13 tomorrow . . . how can he engage in the delicate computations of quantum theory physics? If Johnny thinks that a fraction is something that happened to his uncle's ankle, how can he weigh the chemicals for a rocket or split an atom? If Johnny can't understand Shakespeare or the Bible —if he writes home from college that the *prima donna* couldn't sing because she was "a little horse" —how can you expect him to rub two ideas together in any field and get a blaze of Promethean fire?

This is no fantastic charge. In The New York Times (February 11, 1958) a news story tells of a 19-year-old graduate of a New York high school who admitted (under oath in court) that he "could not read his junior high school diploma. Then the defendant . . . conceded that even after three more years of regular high school he could not spell 'character,' 'behavior' and 'citizenship.' The student council members snickered."

And any college teacher knows the inaccuracies, misspellings, crazy interpretations of materials read, that disfigure the minds of high school graduates today. It is the result of "social education": as the gods of the Copybook Maxims know, you can't make the silk purse of culture out of the sow's ear of "life adjustment."

In just the last series of examination papers, among mostly freshmen, I myself encountered these spellings: "magnificance," "sence," "fasinates," "chocked up" (for "choked up"), "revuge" (for "refuge"), *etc.*

THE PEDAGOGUES, indeed, have left their victims much as the school masters left Mr. Polly's mind: "His mind was in much the same state, dear reader, as yours would be in if you were operated on for appendicitis by a well-meaning, high-minded, boldly enterprising but badly overworked and underpaid butcher boy, who was superseded toward the climax of the operation by a left-handed cook of high principles but intemperate habits."

For our "education" has been, for some four decades, first "progressive" and then "social"—its criterion being that equality is more important than quality. It has sheltered Johnny from the facts of life (that two plus two are four, that as you sow you reap, that every outside must have an inside); it has insulated him against competition and intellectual dynamics; it has lulled him with the easy rather than challenged him with the hard; it has coddled him into fatty degeneration of the brains. But if you asked the schools to educate Johnny, you were called "an enemy of education"; if you asked the schools to train Johnny's intellect, you were called "anti-intellectual." The pedagogues became the New Pharisees, and their inbreeding through teachers' colleges went on and on, till—but for a saving remnant of resolute students who educated themselves in classical disciplines—we have generations that can't read, can't write, can't spell, can't punctuate, can't add or multiply or divide, can't *think.*

"Social education," with its "life adjustment" and "togetherness," has produced a culture that is, at best, on the primer level—and, at worst, on the comic book level. Why wonder that we don't produce scientists? Why wonder that we get *Some Came Running* instead of *Moby Dick*? *Baby Doll* and not *Leaves of Grass*? *The Death of a Salesman* and not *Walden*?

Education that uses avoirdupois weight — the weight we use for the gross and coarse, for pig-iron, fertilizer, coal—leads only to the gross, the coarse, the stupid. We need to return to troy weight—which, as the dictionary tells us, is "a system of weights for gold, silver, precious stones." But "social education," with its emphasis on mass, equality, and adjustment, never even tries to weigh the "gold, silver, and precious stones" of the mind and soul.

To compound this deficit, "social education" deliberately holds back good students—so that poor students won't feel "unequal." It discourages competition by eliminating grades. It sets equality above quality, mass above meaning, mediocrity above genius. It prates that if everybody doesn't "pass," those who don't will lose their "mental health" and get neurotic, and go berserk and shoot their grandmothers. The papers are full of news of ungodly little tykes who do "pass" and shoot their grandmothers all the more blithely; but who expects logic from a "new educator"? I read not long ago of a teen-ager who shot his grandmother because she courteously asked him to mow the family lawn, and another who hanged himself because his allowance of four dollars a week wouldn't keep him in cigarettes . . . but I have a stubborn belief that both the little dullards had "passed." We have been deluged with a spate of slogans and clichés that we must "socialize," that we must foster "togetherness," that we must "adjust" the student; but the result has been the most maladjusted and antisocial generations in our history.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And why not? Students who might have been interested in philosophy, literature, or science, are fed courses on "How to Be Happy on Dates" or "How to Blow Your Nose in Public." The pedagogues incite discussions (theoretically to "see all sides," but in reality to present only one) on "the United Nations." The pedagogues try to "socialize" children so that, without your ever making yourself lovable, everybody will love you. Where is the noble process of individual thought which Wordsworth, looking at the statue of Sir Isaac Newton, called "Voyaging on strange seas of thought—alone"? Where is even a whisper of Emerson's brave self-reliance? Of Thoreau's "If a man does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer"? That, of course, would contradict our life-adjustment-to-mediocrity! Thus our pedagogues have cheapened and vulgarized the generations; turned our schools into serve-yourself chain stores; drowned initiative, individuality, competition, under the muddy flood of planned mediocrity. How do you expect such schools to produce scientists—or men?

Especially pernicious in destroying mental vigor have been courses in "mental health." They, with their silly questionnaires, have infected the innocent mind of youth with perversion.*

Children are asked: "Do you sometimes feel bad because your feet are too large or too small? . . . Do your legs often feel too tense? . . . Do you believe that people who have to work for a living are just as good as those who have plenty of money? . . . Does your family own an electric refrigerator? . . . Are you having trouble in deciding whether you are in love? . . . Are you embarrassed by talk about sex? . . . Are you afraid that God is going to punish you? . . . Do you entertain thoughts of suicide?"

Such hideous probings of the inner life—such fingering of your heart to find out if it is beating, such thrusting of your fists into your bowels to find if they are there—are the ordinary routines of what is called "psychology," "sociology," "guiding and counselling" and "mental health" in our schools today. Is it any wonder that we don't have sane and judicious minds? The wonder is that we don't have *more* juvenile delinquents and comic book mentalities than we do: youth must be basically sound to survive such lethal perversions!

All Russia had to do to get a few scientists was to toss "social education" into the discard, and concentrate on discipline, competition, brain power, and rigorous training in the classic three R's. We could equal or surpass Soviet attainments in no time if we would return to integrity and intellect, to wisdom and to will. We could begin to have education tomorrow if we would fertilize its roots with the discarded corpse of progressivism.

CERTAIN QUITE simple and feasible steps could start our return to sanity:

● *First, the individual states should repeal their lobby-incited laws that require teachers to take courses in "education" (i.e., pedagogy). The states should abolish all teachers' colleges (as such), and turn them into schools of the liberal arts—giving stimulating but rigorous training, not in "techniques of teaching," but in the subject matter of the arts, literature, religion, philosophy, history. (Who ever saw a Professor of Education who could teach anybody anything?)*

● Then the states should withhold all funds from any school that eliminates the grading system, that does not give homework, that has a single course in "How to Be Happy on a Date," *etc.*, or that whispers "life adjustment" even under the table.

● *Most of all, the states should change the emphasis from "more classrooms" to "more classwork." Education should return to Christian realism: "Many are called, few are chosen . . . Strait is the gate and narrow is the road. . . ."*

But this will only improve intellectual power. Important as that is, it is not enough. Our pragmatists, relativists and positivists insist that standards, values, principles, qualities and absolutes must be contradicted by education. They run amok if you try to bring religion and morality into education. (This is like asking the brain to think but denying that the heart should pump blood.) They say that if you want a bridge built, you should get the technically best engineer, irrespective of his philosophy or his religion. But such an engineer is a mere robot of skills, who may be a genius in his means and yet an amoeba (or a wolf) in his ends. Without principles, he may take a bribe to build the best bridge in the worst place. He may take his cut and keep his mouth shut about the shoddy materials assigned him. He may get drunk at the moment when it is most important for him to be on his job. If you really want a good bridge built, you *may* ask about his skill but you *must* ask about his principles.

Now apply this to education today. We say, hastily and in a kind of frenzy, that education must turn out "more scientists"—but do we ever ask what principles those scientists are to have? We may admit that a Dr. Allan Nunn May, a Dr. Pontecorvo, or a Klaus Fuchs had a great deal of

* See the article, "Guided Minds: The Promise and the Threat," by Emily Cuyler Hammond, in HUMAN EVENTS for June 9, 1958; and news item, "Guided Minds," in HUMAN EVENTS for August 25, 1958.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scientific ability. Shall our education, then, turn out a generation of Mays, Pontecorvos, Fuchses—and call it a day well spent? Will we catch up with the Communists if we produce such "scientists"? If we turn out scientists who regard loyalty as a "superstition" and patriotism as something "corny," what have we gained? If they believe that capitalism is something to attack, and collectivism something to serve, what good will their scientific skills do us? What good will scientists do us if they take their discoveries and, *sub rosa,* send them, wrapped in cellophane and postpaid, to Moscow?

It is important to develop scientific brains, but it is much more important to develop sound principles. A man cannot serve two masters: he must serve either freedom—or Moscow.

If men get drunk on intellectual vodka, if they want their country to play Russian roulette, if they seek to deliver the world into the hands of Big Brother and the patterns of 1984, it would be far better if they were not great scientists.

Therefore our education must be much more than a mere intellectual sharpening of the edge of the brains. It must produce whole men who know that hammers should be used in building free cities and sickles in cutting down wheat—and not in riveting shackles on Hungary or cutting down rebels in China.

THIS IS HIGHLY pertinent to a controversial subject that needs only simple thought for its solution. Suppose that J. Robert Oppenheimer *is* a scientist of high talent. Does that make him an asset to the cause of freedom? If he used his talent willingly to develop a bomb that might be dropped on Japan or Germany (then enemies of the Soviet Union as well as of the United States), but dragged his feet for years and years when it was a question of a more powerful bomb that might fall on the Soviets, just what good is his talent in our present struggle? If, through ignorance or perversity, he associated with known enemies of America, who (at best) might pick his files or his mind, is his scientific ability good for us or bad for us? This is a time when we are poised on a knife-edge over survival or destruction. We cannot survive if we do not use our brains and see that it is possible to develop highly talented scientists who may not also be wise men, who may not even be loyal men; and we should be able to see that, if their principles are wrong and their ends lethal, if they are men without intellectual wisdom or spiritual loyalty, the worse it is that they have scientific skills.

Under the shadow of the Sputnik, scientific skills are not enough. What good are skilled firefighters who are also pyromaniacs? Benedict Arnold was perhaps the most brilliant American general in our War of Independence, but it was not enough: he almost betrayed West Point, he almost opened the inner gate of the Hudson to the enemy. He was a brilliant, *but not a loyal,* soldier . . . he was a general of genius, *but he was not a patriot.* And the Benedict Arnolds of the world, for all their genius, are never enough. How wise was Washington in our hour of most desperate crisis: it was no flourish of patriotism, it was no gesture of rhetoric, it was sober realism when he said "Let none but Americans stand guard tonight."

Beyond all else, education under the shadow of the Sputnik must return to standards, to values, to principles, to absolutes, making the American will single and heroic, setting the eternal stars above the soul. Little blind relativistic fractions of men were never enough, and they are our potential destruction today. We need whole men—George Washington, Nathan Hale, Douglas MacArthur. We need the inexorable fiat: "Let none but Americans stand guard tonight."

John Dewey wrote: "We agree that we are uncertain as to where we are going and where we want to go, and why we are doing what we do." Was there ever a recipe of folly more surely designed to ensure destruction? Education, under the shadow of the Sputnik, must seek the goal and the constant star—must know the whence, the whither, and the why, and must put vision before all else. Its motto must be that of the great Plato: "Education is to turn the eye of the soul toward *light.*"

E. Merrill Root is Professor of English at Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana, and the author of seven books of poetry. He has also written widely on political subjects. His most recent contribution to HUMAN EVENTS was "The Eternal Christmas," December 21, 1957.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "THE SICKNESS OF OUR SCHOOLS: 'PROGRESSIVE' EDUCATION" at $_____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately—at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED